



AAU 2713

CT-269

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Liu, et al.

Serial No. 09/004,544

Filed: January 8, 1998

For: METHOD FOR AND APPARATUS
FOR PERFORMING MPEG II
DEQUANTIZATION AND IDCT

Art Unit: 2713

Examiner: Lee, R.

#13
Rose
9-19-00RECEIVED
SEP 18 2000
TECH CENTER 2700

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service with sufficient
postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

On 9/19/00
Date Lola Salazar

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

This is responsive to the office action mailed August 24, 2000 for the above captioned patent application.

In the office action dated August 24, 2000, the Examiner identifies three groups of claims and requires applicant to select one of the groups for prosecution on the merits under 35 U.S.C. §121 (hereinafter §121). The groups identified by the Examiner are:

- I. Claims 1-4
- II. Claims 5-17
- III. Claims 18-23

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

Applicant elects the claims from Group I for prosecution on the merits. Claims 5-23 are provisionally canceled without prejudice.



TRAVERSE OF THE EXAMINER'S REQUIREMENT

Applicant's attorney has reviewed the statutory basis for the Examiner's position, and particularly the first sentence of 37 CFR §121:

§121 Divisional applications

If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Director may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions.

The law permits a requirement of restriction only when independent and distinct inventions are claimed.

The claims of Group I are directed to dequantization of an encoded video data stream. This dequantization, according to Claim 1, requires a means for receiving an IDCT coefficient matrix. Claim 1 also requires a means for multiplying functions with the IDCT coefficient matrix.

The claims of Group II are directed to "performing IDCT on dequantization video signal data". These two groups of claims are related because they both perform IDCT calculations. Accordingly, the claims of Group I are not independent and distinct from the Claims of Group II.

The claims of Group III are directed to "performing dequantization and IDCT calculations in parallel". Claim 1 is broad enough to encompass any system, whether the dequantization and IDCT calculations are performed sequentially, in parallel, or in any other way. Not only does the subject matter of Claim 1 relate to the subject matter of Groups II and III, it is clear that Claim 1 is generic with respect to the Group III claims.

In sum, there is no viable statutory basis to support the Examiner's position in this instance. Applicant's attorney respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the instant requirement of restriction.

Respectfully submitted,
D'ALESSANDRO & RITCHIE

David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

Dated: September 6, 2000

D'ALESSANDRO & RITCHIE
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel.: (408) 441-1100